

September 21, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

23625

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, September 21, 1965, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

- S. 402. An act for the relief of Oh Wha Ja (Penny Korleen Doughty);
- S. 618. An act for the relief of Nora Isabella Samuelli;
- S. 1198. An act for the relief of the estate of Harley Brewer, deceased; and
- S. 1390. An act for the relief of Rocky River Co. and Macy Land Corp.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

Article entitled "Veteran in Unions Mobilizing Women," written by Bob Tutt and printed in the Houston Chronicle of September 12, 1965, in tribute to Miss Elizabeth Kimmel, a political worker.

By Mr. PELL:

Poem entitled "Lords of the Eagle Eye and Lion Heart," in tribute to Lt. Col. L. Gordon Cooper, Jr., and Lt. Comdr. Charles Conrad, Jr., Astronauts.

AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY IN THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, on Saturday, September 18, in the highly respected daily newspaper, the Christian Science Monitor, appeared an editorial entitled "The Fulbright Speech," which I ask to have printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FULBRIGHT SPEECH

It will be a great pity if Senator Fulbright's Senate speech on the handling of the Dominican crisis leads simply to a fierce public argument about the past. As he himself says, analysis of the past is useful only if it helps to avoid mistakes in the future.

There is validity in Mr. Fulbright's charges of initial "overtimidity" and subsequent "overreaction." But he is careful to say that his assessments are made with the advantage of hindsight. Yet even if one concedes that there were mistakes during those early weeks of the upheaval, we believe that the U.S. Government has since done a good job in trying to pick up the pieces which it perhaps helped to shatter—albeit involuntarily.

Only the first wobbly steps have been made toward normalcy in Santo Domingo. But Ambassador Ellsworth Bunker, tireless and resourceful, would never have been able to encourage those steps if he had not had Washington's backing. It has been a little bit like Macmillan furiously repairing the damage done by Eden at Suez, protesting all the time that no damage had been done. But over the Dominican Republic, the Macmillan and Eden roles are combined in one man—and he wears a Texas hat.

As we have already said, however, we think that what is important now is to eschew the same kind of mistake in the future. Senator Fulbright uttered a few home truths, among them:

"The movement of the future in Latin America is social revolution and the choice which the Latin Americans make will depend

in part on how the United States uses its great influence.

"Since just about every revolutionary movement is likely to attract Communist support, at least in the beginning, the approach followed in the Dominican Republic, if consistently pursued, must inevitably make us the enemy of all revolutions and therefore the ally of all the unpopular and corrupt oligarchies of the hemisphere.

"It should be very clear that the choice is not between social revolution and conservative oligarchy; but whether, by supporting reform, we bolster the popular non-Communist left or whether, by supporting unpopular oligarchies, we drive the rising generation of educated and patriotic young Latin Americans to an embittered and hostile form of communism like that of Fidel Castro."

Admittedly all this is easier to preach than to practice. To begin with, effective communication has to be established with that rising generation—and their confidence won. Their language will differ from ours in many ways. But most of them want for themselves what we have won and want—and the overwhelming majority of them would still prefer not to turn outside the American hemisphere or to alien tyrannies to try to get it.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the editorial makes a point which both the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee and I, as well as other Senators, have been endeavoring to make for some time, that the important matter with respect to our policy in the Dominican Republic, which some of us think has been mistaken, is not what happened in the past, but what should happen in the future.

In this regard, I should hope very much that the attitude of those in the State Department responsible for our Latin-American policy who have become more friendly to democratic nations which are endeavoring to carry out the principles of the Alliance for Progress will be encouraged. This, to me, is of the greatest importance, and is emphasized by a column entitled "A Losing Struggle in Latin America," which appeared in this morning's Washington Post, by the highly respected columnist, Marquis Childs.

Mr. Childs points out that poverty is increasing, not decreasing, in Latin America; that the population problem is becoming worse and not better; and that the hope of saving those nations for freedom and democracy depends, to a very large extent, on the friendly basis on which we in the United States of America advance the cause of free, liberal democratic nations in that portion of the world.

I ask unanimous consent that the Marquis Childs column from today's Washington Post be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A LOSING STRUGGLE IN LATIN AMERICA

(By Marquis Childs)

The rich lands are getting richer and the poor lands are getting poorer. That is the harsh reality that cannot be concealed by any amount of wishful talk put out by administration spokesmen.

This applies with special force to Latin America, since the Alliance for Progress was to reverse the trend in this hemisphere. In country after country the gnawing ache of poverty, hunger, and the revolution of ris-

ing demands bring unrest and disorder. It is no answer, as Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT noted in his speech on the Dominican crisis, to put this down to the machinations of a handful of Communists. Communism will always try to exploit indigenous disorders.

A recent statement that got too little attention underwrites the reality about Latin America. Felipe Herrera, president of the Inter-American Development Bank, a Chilean with wide banking experience, in discussing the prospect of a common market for Latin America, made some personal observations about the present state of affairs. He said:

"The positive efforts undertaken internally by the Latin American countries, especially since the establishment of the Alliance for Progress, to accelerate development and to achieve the necessary reforms in their economic and social structures have not yet substantially altered the current situation in Latin America. Two out of three inhabitants of the region still suffer from chronic malnutrition, per capita agricultural output is lower today than it was 30 years ago and two out of every five adults are illiterate.

"It is not surprising therefore that tensions of every sort are rising as a product of the interacting processes of inflation, sub-standard social conditions, urban pressures created by the mass movement of the rural population to the cities, frustration in the middle class and unrest in the countryside. This inevitably has forced governments to take emergency action on a stopgap basis and has made it difficult to undertake long-term programs on a regional level."

The prospect in the near future is therefore for more explosions like that in the Dominican Republic. Herrera's statement confirms this reporter's findings in a recent tour of South America. It belies the convenient explanation of State Department spokesmen such as Under Secretary Thomas C. Mann who tends to see the unrest in terms of a Communist plot than can be suppressed by force.

Herrera pointed to a recent statement by President George Woods of the World Bank. Addressing the developed countries of the West, Woods said that the "present level of financing (for the underdeveloped countries) is wholly inadequate."

Since 1961 the long-term public capital supplied by the developed countries struggling to get going has held at about the same level. This has been true even though the gross national product of the industrialized countries has increased during this period at a rate of 4 to 5 percent a year. Consequently, Herrera observed, the net official assistance from the industrialized countries represents a declining percentage of their national income.

For the underdeveloped countries this level of aid has meant a decreasing amount in per capita terms because of the population explosion. This is the simple arithmetic demonstrating that the rich are getting richer while the poor get poorer.

In spite of a steadily increasing population, as Herrera noted, per capita income increased by over 2.5 percent in 1964 which was the goal set by the Charter of Punta del Este in 1961. The same increase is in prospect for 1965. This was part of the optimism expressed by Assistant Secretary for Inter-American Affairs Jack Hood Vaughn on his recent tour of the Americas.

The 2.5 percent gain is from such a low base—about \$200 a year in many countries—that it is meaningless. Vaughn rightfully said that the Alliance is doing many splendid things. It is pointing the way to the changes essential if the desperately poor nations to the south are to move forward and begin the kind of economic integration that can mean real progress.

But it is the limited scale on which these changes have begun to take place that cannot be concealed by optimistic talk. For what the facts show, as a responsible banker has now suggested, is the need for a new and far broader dimension for the Alliance.

A book President Johnson is said to have read and reread is Barbara Ward's "The Rich Nations and the Poor Nations." It may be that a new edition, "Richer Nation and Poorer Nations" is due.

WHAT GOES ON IN THE SKY?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, one of the most controversial matters now before this country is whether the decision by the President to authorize the Air Force to construct a military observation laboratory in outer space was or was not wise. In that connection, I ask unanimous consent that what I consider to be an excellent editorial, written by Norman Cousins in the Saturday Review of September 11, 1965, entitled "What Goes On in the Sky?" be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

WHAT GOES ON IN THE SKY?

On various occasions during the past year, President Lyndon B. Johnson has stressed the importance of continuity in U.S. foreign policy. One aspect of that continuity is now in question. We refer to the policy of President Dwight D. Eisenhower and President John F. Kennedy on the need to avoid a nightmarish danger of colossal dimensions to the American people and the world's peoples in general. This danger arose the moment man discovered he was able to liberate himself from earth's gravity and go cruising in space. For this development meant that space stations could become the orbiting carriers of atomic weapons, putting the entire planet under the nuclear gun.

President Eisenhower was the first to warn of this Orwellian horror. He spoke of the very real possibility of accident or miscalculation that could trigger an unspeakable holocaust. And even without accident or miscalculation, weapons in orbit would convert the sky into a grim canopy. Prime Minister Harold Macmillan fully supported President Eisenhower's declaration against nuclear weapons in space.

On coming to office, President Kennedy gave high priority to the need for effective agreements aimed at preventing military spacecraft from occupying outer space. Both through the United Nations and through direct negotiations with Premier Nikita Khrushchev, President Kennedy persisted with his effort to insure that space would be reserved for peaceful purposes. As a result, both the United States and the Soviet Union issued declarations of intent against military operations in space. The United Nations, on October 17, 1963, endorsed this action and called upon all other nations to be bound by it. Though the potential military use of rockets was inherent in the development of space technology, neither country crossed the line into military ventures. In fact, the space program in the United States had been deliberately put under civilian control, just as President Truman years earlier successfully fought to keep atomic energy development in nonmilitary hands. To be sure, the U.S. Air Force had been pressing for a prominent role in space development, but Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy held to their contention that outer space should be out of bounds to the military.

The continuity of this policy has now been broken. On August 25, 1965, President Johnson announced he had authorized the Air

Force to proceed with its plans for a Manned Orbiting Laboratory. While it was emphasized that the MOL would not be armed with nuclear firepower, the MOL nevertheless represents a specific military use of space vehicles. As such, it is a step toward the direct extension of the arms race into outer space.

What makes the matter all the more inexplicable is that no one has stated the case against military activity in space more cogently than President Johnson himself—in the very act of making the announcement about MOL. He did not make clear beyond a reasonable doubt, however, why the MOL and also the involvement of the Air Force do not run counter to the United Nations resolution signed by the United States, or the policy of Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy, or his own statement about the importance of preventing the extension of military technology into space.

If the principal opposing argument here is that the MOL will be unarmed, this may meet a technicality, but it does not meet the problem created by the fact that the door is now open to a long line of new developments in the field of orbiting laboratories. In past negotiations for arms limitation and control, the United States has properly emphasized the need for adequate inspection. Yet we have now taken the initiative in a field where inspection is most improbable and virtually impossible. For the Russians, inevitably, will now send up MOLs of their own, and there will be no way of knowing whether these spacecraft will be secretly armed with nuclear gun mounts. The very existence of such a possibility is certain to produce a clamor in the United States for armed space vehicles of our own. And the stage will be set for other nations to join the horror, cluttering up the sky with death-disseminating vehicles and blocking out man's vision of a rational world in which to live out his life with reasonable faith in the sanity and decency of his fellow man.

We pride ourselves on being an educated nation. But we have not yet learned the most fundamental lesson of the atomic age. This is the lesson that our safety and security no longer depend on the accumulation, multiplication, or refinement of force, but on the control of force. For the force cannot be used without destroying security, shattering freedom, and making a weird farce of claims for human uniqueness, human intelligence, human nobility. What will it profit us in the last instant of recorded time to know that we stood supreme among all the nations of the world in the variety, multiplicity, efficiency, and sophistication of the force that figured in the final holocaust? Inherent in our history are higher distinctions. The time in which to put those distinctions fully to work grows short.

DANGER SIGNAL—AMERICAN FAMILIES SAVING LESS, BORROWING MORE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, few economic commentators have noticed it, but there has been an interesting change in spending and saving habits by the American people in recent months that may have considerable significance for our economy.

For years economic experts appearing before the Joint Economic Committee have asserted that Americans are inclined to save between 7 and 8 percent of their income. They save a little more in good times, especially in war times when goods are scarce and saving is vigorously promoted as patriotic and somewhat less in depression times when

incomes are low and more is needed to meet firm obligations and necessities.

There has been a recent, dramatic change in this pattern, in part because the statistics have been modified. But also allowing for the statistical change there has been a distinct diminution, a fall off in the savings of Americans in recent months.

Now, Mr. President, this is a phenomenon because the present times cannot by any stretch of the imagination be considered depression times. In fact we have never had anything like the prosperity that has come to this Nation this year.

Last year was a great year for the American economy. This year appears to be far better. Just this morning I received a copy of the "Economic Indicators" for September—the latest statistical report on our economic progress, and it is mighty good reading. In the second quarter gross national product smashed all record, business and professional income, rental income, dividend income, corporate profits, wages—all continued to leap ahead. Unemployment continues at the lowest level in years. It is still much too high for teenagers, minority groups, and unskilled. But for married men it is down to 2.6 percent. Average hourly earnings have jumped to \$2.60 and weekly earnings to more than \$106 in manufacturing industries.

And yet the American people are saving less and substantially less of their income.

There are many possible explanations for this phenomenon, more confidence in the ability of the Federal Government to keep the economy moving, greater reliance on social security, medicare, etc. for the future, more efficient promotion of automobiles, appliances and other income absorbing expenditure.

At any rate this changing pattern should significantly alter expectations and forecasts for our economic future.

One other significant economic statistical development in the sharp jump in the proportion of income the American people are pouring into interest. This is directly related to the phenomenal growth in installment credit—the time buying of everything from vacations and furniture to automobiles and clothing. The increase is really spectacular. In fact today interest as a proportion of income is almost exactly twice what it was in 1950.

Both of these developments—the reduced tendency of the American people to save in a period of prosperity and the soaring expenditure for interest could be danger signals. The last time the propensity to save dropped sharply in a relative prosperity period was in the late twenties. The sharply increased expenditure for interest demonstrates how extended millions of American families have become in borrowing to buy, and how susceptible they could be to an interruption of their income because of a recession.

George Shea of the Wall Street Journal deals thoughtfully and perceptively with these developments in a column in yesterday's Wall Street Journal. I ask unanimous consent that the column be printed in the Record.

4 a.m. because he had received information the embassy might be attacked by a group with special demolition equipment. Fortunately that attack never came off.

Now after almost 5 months of tragedy, frustrations, and travail in the Dominican Republic, a brighter future beckons for the Dominican people. A provisional government—moderate in complexion and avoiding the extremes of both left and right—has taken office under the distinguished leadership of Dr. Hector Garcia Godoy, and the people will have a free choice for the future in elections to be held within 9 months. For those interested in comparisons, Fidel Castro took over in Cuba in 1959, and there has been no election since.

Harsh developments dictated hard decisions in April. Those decisions achieved several important results. In consequence of them several things did not occur.

1. No American civilians lost their lives, although one remembers with sadness that 24 gallant men of our Armed Forces gave their lives in the stern tasks that fell their lot. Close to 5,000 persons from 46 nations were evacuated safely from the country. These evacuees, almost 5,000 of them, went voluntarily, the departure of each testifying to his individual estimate of the dangers in the situation.

2. The Communists were prevented from taking over in a chaotic situation and pushing aside democratic elements involved in the revolt. Communist tactics contributed to the long delay in reaching a settlement, but at the same time made their presence more publicly apparent than had been the case at the beginning. Their leadership has not changed.

3. Another development which thankfully did not occur was that the fighting did not spread throughout the country, as seemed decidedly possible on more than one occasion. Disorders were confined to one or two areas in the capital city, and a major civil war with much wider consequences and untold loss of life was prevented.

In a situation in which distribution and transportation of foodstuffs was almost completely disrupted and imports to an island nation cut off, starvation was avoided. Along with other actions taken by the United States and the OAS to shore up the country's paralyzed economy, more than 63 million pounds of food were distributed to the hungry, substantial quantities of it directly by our soldiers and marines. Medicines and medical care and other vital services were provided. Private American citizens and companies and voluntary relief agencies made generous food and medical contributions, as did 11 other American republics from Argentina to Mexico. Brazil, Costa Rica, Honduras, Nicaragua, and Paraguay have joined with the United States in supplying military units to make up the Inter-American Peace Force, which is a guarantee of order and protection for rehabilitation and progress.

It was one thing to stave off disaster. Now the need is for positive, productive action to build a better nation, with greater participation for all its citizens. A moderate, progressive government needs our help and cooperation and will get it. Suffice it to say that the situation continues to be a most complex one—and one that requires our best efforts.

It is worth underlining here that modern Dominican democracy is really only 4 years old, dating from 1961, when the country broke loose from 31 years of the harsh Trujillo dictatorship. Today's complicated problems derive in large measure from the political, social, and economic stresses accompanying the emergence from the long night of totalitarianism—the social frustrations and the pent-up demands for more economic opportunity and a better life—for more jobs and more food. Our task and our

objective is to respond to this desire for change in the social structure and to find rational ways in which the demands of a new society can be met.

The United States and fellow nations of the Americas, acting through the Organization of American States, are now mustering manpower and resources to help energize and build the country whose fertile valleys and wave-tossed shores were so admired by Christopher Columbus. Agriculture, transportation, and education will have priority in these efforts, and there will be specific projects in such areas as housing, irrigation, school construction, cattle production, and farm-to-market roads, as well as maintenance of the existing road net. An important part of our effort will be to help private enterprise repair its damages, increase its productive facilities and put people to work.

All these activities, whether in the Dominican Republic or elsewhere in the world, rest on cooperation and understanding. This brings us to communications, for the communication of understanding is an important factor in making effective this Nation's foreign policy, a policy based on truths, progress, and freedom. Communications is perhaps best defined as the ability to talk to each other and be understood by each other. It is much harder than many realize. Each of us has our own frame of reference. We tend, naturally enough, to accept the history of our country as the only correct history and the only really important one. Other people put similar emphasis on their own history.

Modern transportation and the speed of the news industry means that today groups with vastly different frames of reference are attempting to communicate with one another on a scale hitherto not possible. These differences between groups and peoples make communication difficult—basic differences in religion for example. Some religions believe in one God, others in many. Some have life after death as a tenet of their faith; others reject that idea. Some consider that the killing of even a fly, not to mention a cow, is a crime; others hold that killing in the name of their God is the surest way to heaven. These are fundamental differences as to the very purpose and meaning of life.

There are great differences of culture. The differences between the urban and rural approach to every day problems has been a lasting aspect of our political life in this country. And there is of course in today's divided world the basic difference between Communist and non-Communist, and the almost impassable semantic boundary. The Communists have precise but very different meanings from our own for many words, such as democracy, republic, popular, elections, etc. These differences are one reason why negotiations with people like the Russians and the Chinese are so frustrating and interminable.

In the struggle to win men's minds, we have got to communicate effectively with the sugarcane cutter in the Caribbean, with the coffee harvester in Central America, with the Indian herdsman in the wind-swept villages of the high Andes, with the planter in the rice paddies of southeast Asia. The tools of language are required, of course. But foremost these fellow members of the human family can use a friendly hand with their problems. We work with them to increase their crops through new techniques; we assist their local doctors by offering them modern practices; we persuade them and their neighbors of the advantage of community development, of a closer working relationship with their neighbors. It is done with honest toil and basic truth.

Recently at the swearing-in ceremony for the new Director of the U.S. Information Agency, Mr. Leonard Marks, President John-

son quoted the following from Mr. Marks' writings: "Communications is the lifeline of civilization. Without it, people live in small tribal societies, suspicious of strange and different customs. With improved communications comes better understanding and a removal of the barriers of suspicion and distrust. When we know our neighbors, we are more likely to become friends, philosophically and socially, and from this relationship may evolve a world dedicated to the preservation of law in an atmosphere of peace."

The President went on to say in his own words: "I believe this is a new era in the affairs of man and the relations between nations. It is an era of greater maturity—and I hope that our own goals and standards may also mature. I hope we shall not expect quick answers to ancient questions, that we shall not expect simple solutions to complex problems. I especially hope we may not strive foolishly and vainly for the world's love and affection when what we really seek is the world's respect and the world's trust."

You and I—all of us—are engaged in the great adventure of communications as a means to achieve this respect and trust on the part of others. To those of you who labor in the vineyards of the press, the radio, the television, and other mass media, I would recall our common responsibility to get the facts, to be accurate, to be objective. And as one who has spent a good part of his time in recent years—along the border of the Iron Curtain in Central Europe, in the Balkans, and the Eastern Mediterranean with their age-old feuds, and now in the turbulent Caribbean—trying to compose problems of varying difficulty, I feel qualified to observe on the basis of some tender experience that it is usually easier to find fault than to find solutions.

Around the world our country is engaged on many fronts and in many fields. As our fellow Georgian, Secretary of State Dean Rusk, recently observed: "It is the purpose of the Department of State to try to bring about what some people will call a boring situation; that is, a period of peace. I should not object if we got international relations off the front page for a while. I see no prospect of it."

"But settlement is our object, and settlement frequently is not very newsworthy."

But peace is elusive, and the way of the peacemaker often leads across stony and unyielding ground. President Kennedy reminded us that "only a few generations have been granted the role of defending freedom in its hour of maximum danger." That is a proud and demanding role—one that befits a great nation and demands its best.

To close I would recall the words of Euripides in describing ancient Athens—a world power in its time which, not unlike our own country today, was the leader of a coalition of free communities against those who would smother freedom and stifle democracy. Euripides wrote with pride and compassion of the penalties of power when he spoke of Athens as a city which "takes much and bears it; (and) therefore she is blessed."

EXHIBIT 2

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, September 17, 1965.

FELTON GORDON,
Dinner Chairman, Big Beef Banquet Progressive Club, Atlanta, Ga.:

I am very happy to join the many friends of Tapley Bennett as they gather to applaud his dedicated record of public service. Yours is a richly deserved tribute to an outstanding professional who has shown his coolness, courage, and good judgment in danger and difficulty. To Ambassador Bennett and to all his fellow Georgians who honor him this evening, I extend my warmest good wishes for a memorable event.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

EXHIBIT 3

[From the Atlanta Journal, Sept. 17, 1965]

AMBASSADOR BENNETT

Our Ambassador to Santo Domingo is W. Tapley Bennett, Jr. A Georgian, Ambassador Bennett is a frequent (and current) visitor to Atlanta.

Now that the Dominican crisis seems settled there is a lot of second guessing going on in Washington. Did the administration handle the matter correctly? Or was the President panicked into sending troops?

The Journal has been with the administration, therefore it was good to read that recent criticism by Senator J. W. Fulbright has in turn been criticized by a substantial part of Washington.

Senator Fulbright thought the President did wrong to act on Mr. Bennett's advice that the situation was out of hand.

A lot of the Senate has disagreed with Senator Fulbright.

On September 8, the Journal looked at it this way, and the Journal still does.

"The Dominican problem has been an intense one. After our Cuban experience with 'democratic liberators' this country has followed it with anxiety plus cynicism.

"But alas . . . there are indications many of our writers and political theorists are closer to the dream world than reality."

We didn't say Senators then, but we now add them to the list.

Welcome home, Mr. Bennett. Remember the newspapers and members of the intelligentsia who first thought Castro a democratic hero?

They haven't learned much since.

But the rest of us seem to have learned the valuable lesson that so-called popular fronts today are fronts for the Communists rather than the people.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, I yield the floor to the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I thank my friend, the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. President, the defense of Ambassador Bennett by the Senator from Georgia does him credit, as an old friend and as a constituent. I do not think any of us who feel that perhaps the Ambassador's judgment was not entirely sound, our feeling being based, as we have admitted, on Monday morning quarterbacking, would question in any way the Ambassador's integrity, loyalty, or devotion to duty. There is no further reason for me to further defend the able and distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee [Mr. Fulbright], and I have nothing further to say on that matter.

WATER QUALITY ACT OF 1965-- CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference of the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 4) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, to establish the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, to provide grants for research and development, to increase grants for construction of municipal sewage treatment works, to authorize the establishment of standards of water quality to aid in preventing, controlling, and abating pollution of interstate waters, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina in the chair). The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of Friday, September 17, 1965, pp. 23372-23374, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, the conference report on S. 4 represents a reasonable and sound compromise on the Water Quality Act of 1965. As my colleagues know, it was not easy to obtain agreement on this legislation. On the primary issue of water quality standards there were strong opinions on both sides of the table. In the end, however, the agreement we reached represents both a middle ground and, in many respects, an improvement over the original version as it passed the Senate.

I want to take this opportunity to express my appreciation and gratitude to the Senate conferees, Senators RANDOLPH, MOSS, BOGGS, and PEARSON. The unanimity we reached on the basic issues in S. 4 strengthened our hand immeasurably and added to the quality of the discussions in conference. Through the months since the House enacted its version of S. 4 the Senate Members of the conference and their staffs reviewed the two proposals. Many of their suggestions were incorporated in the final version and contributed to the successful agreement between the representatives of the two bodies. Partisan differences were forgotten in the common effort to develop a meaningful act for the enhancement of the quality of our national water supplies.

The discussions in the conference were vigorous, but amicable. The delay in agreement is a measure of the strong feelings related to matters of principle rather than to any unwillingness to reach a consensus. I could not report to my colleagues on the conference without paying tribute to the House conferees for the contribution they made to this legislation on behalf of the House of Representatives and particularly to Congressmen JOHN BLATNIK and ROBERT JONES for their leadership on S. 4 and in the general effort toward water pollution control and abatement.

I shall not take the time of my colleagues to review in detail the entire conference report on S. 4. That report, and the report of the managers on the part of the House, can be found on pages 23371-23376 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for September 17, 1965.

In brief, the conferees agreed on the establishment of a water pollution control administration in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, headed by an Administrator and supervised by an assistant secretary. The Senate conferees accepted the House version, which transfers all of the activities of the present division of water supply and pollution control to the new Administration and spells out in detail the procedures

to be used in transferring personnel. We believe an orderly transition can be made from the present arrangement under the Public Health Service to the new Administration.

The managers for both the Senate and the House agreed that the selection of the Administrator is crucial to the success of the program and that his grade level and status should reflect the importance the Congress attaches to this program in establishing it as a separate Administration.

The Senate conferees accepted the House proposals on increased authorizations for sewage treatment grants. These include an increase to \$150 million a year for the next 2 years in the total authorization and an increase to \$1,200,000 in individual project authorizations and \$4,800,000 for multi-community projects. Funds appropriated in excess of \$100 million in each of the next 2 fiscal years will be allotted to the several States on the basis of population and individual project authorization limitations will not apply on the use of such funds where States match the Federal contribution.

The Senate conferees agree to these provisions as a temporary measure because of the demonstrated crisis in such States as New York. I know that Senators JAVITS and KENNEDY are very much concerned about this problem. At the same time, the Senate conferees made it very clear that the increases in authorizations and the modifications in the allocation formula do not represent a judgment as to the realistic levels of Federal grants or formula in the years ahead. The Senate Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution is examining this problem and will make recommendations in the next session of the Congress.

The next major provision in the act is the water quality standards section. As it passed the Senate, S. 4 authorized the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to establish water quality standards on interstate waters or portions thereof in the absence of effective State standards, following a conference of affected Federal, State, interstate, municipal, and industrial representatives. Violation of established standards would be subject to enforcement in accordance with the present enforcement procedures in the Water Pollution Control Act.

The House version of S. 4 contained a provision for States to file letters of intent on the establishment of water quality criteria, with a pollution control grant penalty for failure to file such a letter of intent. There was no provision for the establishment of water quality standards.

The conferees agreed to amend the Senate version to give the States until June 30, 1967, to establish water quality standards on interstate waters which the Secretary determines are consistent with the purposes of the act. In those cases where the States fail to establish such standards the Secretary is authorized to call a conference of affected, Federal, State, interstate, municipal, and industrial representatives to discuss proposed standards, after which the Secre-

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I do not wish to draw the Senator into a discussion of the illustrations he used a moment ago, but it runs in my mind that there never have been 20 percent of the Russian people who are Communists, or even 10 percent. In my judgment, less than 10 percent of the people in Russia are Communists.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I do not wish to draw the Senator into a discussion of the illustrations he used a moment ago, but it runs in my mind that there never have been 20 percent of the Russian people who are Communists, or even 10 percent. In my judgment, less than 10 percent of the people in Russia are Communists.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Yes, the disciplined members of the Communist Party.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. That is right. It only requires a very small percentage of dedicated Communists who are absolutely indifferent to human life, human suffering, human liberties, and the rights of others, when a country is in a chaotic condition, to seize the power of government and impose their will on the vast majority. It has happened time and again.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The Senator is entirely correct.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I thank the distinguished Senator from Iowa.

Mr. President, aside from this discussion, what concerns me today has been the attempt to make a whipping boy of Ambassador Tap Bennett by those who happen to disagree with the policy and the action of our National Government.

Ambassador Bennett is an experienced and distinguished career diplomat. It happens that he is a native of my State. I have known him since he was a small boy. I have known his father and his mother for many years. I also knew both of his grandfathers, and had the honor to serve in the legislature in my State, when I was the youngest member of that body, with one of them. Only last year, I enjoyed a midday meal, which we still call dinner where I come from, with Ambassador Bennett's father and mother on their Franklin County farm in the rolling red clay hills of northeast Georgia.

I can assure the Senate that Ambassador Bennett does not come of a stock that panics and frightens very easily; he is a man of sound commonsense with both feet on the ground. It is a grievous disservice to this dedicated and patriotic public servant to suggest that when the chips were down and danger was impending, he gave the President faulty information and panicky advice.

I have known Ambassador Bennett in other posts. I visited him in Greece, when he was serving in the Embassy there. I have never known a career diplomat who endeavors more strenuously to keep in touch with the little people in the country where he is stationed than does Ambassador Bennett. He had visited virtually every community in the Dominican Republic prior to the crisis, though he had not been in that nation for any great length of time.

Last Friday, Ambassador Bennett was guest speaker at a dinner given by the professional communications media

he did not reply to his critics, but the Ambassador did relate, from his rather unique vantage point of having been on the scene, some of the events that took place in Santo Domingo during the bloody fighting which initiated the revolution. He also summarized three salient consequences that resulted from our intervention in that fighting. They are brief, and I should like to read them to the Senate.

This is his own summary:

1. No American civilians lost their lives, although one remembers with sadness that the gallant men of our Armed Forces gave their lives in the stern tasks that fell their lot. Close to 5,000 persons from 46 nations were evacuated safely from the country. These evacuees, almost 5,000 of them, went voluntarily, the departure of each testifying to his individual estimate of the dangers in the situation.

I interpolate here, Mr. President, to say that that is a point that I have not yet heard made, that almost 5,000 citizens of 46 nations, who were in Santo Domingo and saw what was taking place, thought it was an extremely dangerous and precarious situation, and voluntarily left the country. Many of them left behind substantial business interests. I have talked to two or three citizens of my State who were engaged in agriculture in there, who left, and there was no doubt in their minds but that it was a very dangerous situation—one that they considered to be critical insofar as preventing a Communist takeover in that unfortunate state was concerned.

I resume the reading of the summary by Ambassador Bennett:

2. The Communists were prevented from taking over in a chaotic situation and pushing aside democratic elements involved in the revolt. Communist tactics contributed to the long delay in reaching a settlement, but at the same time made their presence more publicly apparent than had been the case at the beginning. Their leadership has not changed.

3. Another development which thankfully did not occur was that the fighting did not spread throughout the country, as seemed decidedly possible on more than one occasion. Disorders were confined to one or two areas in the capital city, and a major civil war with much wider consequences and untold loss of life was prevented.

Mr. President, I believe Ambassador Bennett's remarks in Atlanta were extremely timely and pertinent to the current debate and discussion of our Dominican policy, and I ask unanimous consent that his address be published in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. (See exhibit 1.)

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, I also wish to call to the Senate's attention a telegram warmly praising Ambassador Bennett sent by President Johnson on the occasion of the Ambassador's appearance in Atlanta. I ask unanimous consent to have this telegram and an editorial appearing in the Atlanta Journal of September 17 concerning the Dominican discussion printed in the Record following Ambassador Bennett's speech.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. (See exhibits 2 and 3.)

EXHIBIT 1

COMMUNICATIONS AS A KEY TO UNDERSTANDING

(Address by Hon. W. Tapley Bennett, U.S. Ambassador to the Dominican Republic, on receipt of the Big Beef Award at banquet sponsored by Atlanta Chapters of American Women in Radio and Television, Public Relations Society of America, Sigma Delta Chi Fraternity, Theta Sigma Phi Society, Atlanta, Ga., Sept. 17, 1965)

Only this morning I flew away from an island in the Caribbean which in recent months has known the tragedy of civil strife and the horrors of violence out of control. Decisive action by your Government and other governments of this hemisphere brought an end to the major bloodletting. After arduous and often frustrating negotiations by a committee of the Organization of the American States which lasted more than 3 months, a path for rehabilitation and reconstruction has now been marked out.

We have known violent rioting in our own country in these past months, and the death toll in the recent events in Los Angeles came, I believe, to some 35. By way of perhaps inapt comparison estimates of the deaths in Santo Domingo in the chaos of late April and early May run up to 3,000. I personally think that figure is too high, that a more correct toll of that fratricidal strife would be somewhere between 1,500 and 2,000. But no one will ever know for certainty.

I recall the worst nights in April and May, when up to 70 people were using my house to catch a few hours of sleep. During that period nine snipers were dispatched from their positions around the Embassy property, on which my residence also stands. Conditions were obviously not such as to permit people to go to their homes, and they groped their way up through the garden from office to residence in the pitch black night—and there is nothing darker than a tropical night without a moon—in conditions resembling a London blackout. Most of them stretched out on the floor, after the first 15 to arrive had got the available beds. By way of personal footnote—during the 6-week period from April 28 to June 2, my kitchen served up 1,963 meals, feeding everyone from the American President's Special Assistant for National Security Affairs to the Dominican gardener's granddaughter.

I think back to the bravery of young American girls, some of them in their first tour of duty as secretaries abroad, sitting calmly and typing away at 3 in the morning on telegrams to Washington while guns popped outside. Then there was the young civilian officer who day after day drove a highly flammable fuel truck through the fighting downtown because the powerplant had to be kept going—and then indignantly refused an honor award offered him from Washington with the comment that he was only doing his duty. And there was the petite woman officer who shouldered her way time and again through an undisciplined mob in one of the dock areas because she had things to do in the customs warehouse. And the Army lieutenant colonel on my staff who interposed himself calmly between two groups of men armed with submachineguns when they were about to open fire on each other, acting to protect several hundred Americans awaiting evacuation who were directly in the line of fire behind one group. Somehow these simple acts of heroism didn't seem often to get into the press accounts of the crisis. And so here I pay tribute to those who did their duty—and more—at an anxious time.

Certainly none of us there will forget the lift we got one night when President Johnson with great thoughtfulness, called up at

Approved For Release 2003/10/15 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000500110028-5

and Northern and Western Europe. Immigrants tend to oppose immigrants from Latin America, Southern and Eastern Europe, Russia, the Middle East, and Asia.

The American people have a right to know just whose interests we seek to serve by passing this legislation. Are we, by passing this bill, acting in the national interest? Do we really need added hordes of new immigrants to further multiply the many acute domestic problems we face today? Or are we just being magnanimous in slavish addiction to some strained concept of altruism?

I am well aware that all Americans—aside from the native Indians—are descended from immigrants and that it can be truly said that we are a Nation of immigrants. But there comes a time—as with most things—when a saturation point is reached and moderation should be practiced. I think we have long since reached the point in this field where moderation is needed. America, the world's great melting pot, already runneth over. We need no increase in immigration.

We need no change in our immigration law, and we should tell those who criticize our policies to direct their complaints at the other countries of the world whose immigration programs are far more restrictive than our liberal laws and practices.

This measure should be defeated, and I shall vote against it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, as I conclude my remarks, to have printed at this point in the Record an editorial entitled "Why Do We Want To Bring More People to the United States?" published in the North Little Rock Times of September 16, 1965.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

WHY DO WE WANT TO BRING MORE PEOPLE TO THE UNITED STATES?

Now before the Senate is President Johnson's immigration bill, which has as its major purpose the repeal of the national origins quota system. What this means is that if the bill passes, the United States would favor no nation over another one in accepting new residents. We have been showing favoritism since 1924—admitting immigrants in proportion to the makeup of our population. For instance, since there were many more descendants of Englishmen living in this country than Italians the quota for Great Britain was set at 65,361 and for Italy, 5,666. This looked like raw prejudice when viewed in the light of the Great Society. So it had to go, even though most other nations see nothing wrong in being arbitrary and highly selective about whom they let into their country. Australia, for example, takes no Negroes. Liberia accepts no white people. Israel will take only Jews, and Japan and Switzerland allow no immigrants at all.

Of more concern to us than the origins of immigrants, however, is the number of them who come in each year. We hope the Senate, unlike the House, will be able to do more to limit immigration. Why should we be looking for ways to bring in more people? There are 7,200 persons born every day in this country, a rate that will give us a population of 240 million people in 1980. Seventy percent of our residents live in the cities—the exact spot that all immigrants seem to head for. Right now we are passing all kinds of social legislation to eliminate poverty and reduce unemployment, which, among Negroes, was

more of our unskilled and underprivileged Americans are going to find it harder to support themselves as machines replace men. Many immigrants will join these ranks of the unemployed, no matter how carefully they are screened. A Brazilian off a coffee plantation can live a thousand times better on relief in Chicago or New York than he can on his country's average per capita income of \$123 a year.

Now the bill has a ceiling of 170,000 for the Eastern Hemisphere. The very least that the Senate ought to do before it passes this bill is to put some kind of a ceiling on the nations in this hemisphere, too—especially Latin America, where the population is going to double in 20 years. Congressmen MILES and GARDNER did their best to get a quota of 115,000 for the Western Hemisphere put into the bill, but the amendment was defeated mainly because the State Department said that it would embarrass the United States to limit immigration from our neighbor countries. Why should it embarrass us? Great Britain was not embarrassed when it reduced immigration from its own colonies in the Caribbean from 20,000 to 8,500. Plainly, the English are disturbed about unemployment and the population explosion and are trying to do something about it. Why should we be ashamed to do likewise?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I object. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will resume the call of the roll.

The legislative clerk resumed the call of the roll.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

THE SITUATION IN THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC—TRIBUTE TO AMBASSADOR W. TAPLEY BENNETT, JR.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, during the past several days there has been a great deal of discussion and debate on the floor of the Senate, and, indeed, in the press and throughout the country, concerning the President's decision last April to intervene in the bloody civil strife that then gripped Santo Domingo.

The President was compelled to send U.S. Armed Forces to that riot-torn and chaotic island in order to prevent the loss of American lives and property and to prevent the possibility of a Communist takeover.

Now, 5 months later, the President's prudent, patriotic, and forthright action has come under heavy criticism by the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. FULBRIGHT), and others who apparently feel that there was no real danger to American citizens on the island and that the threat of a Communist takeover was exaggerated.

Mr. President, a great deal of the

criticism of our actions in Santo Domingo is apparently not directed directly at the President personally, but the charge has been made by certain critics that the President was a gullible victim of faulty advice given, among others, by our Ambassador in Santo Domingo, Tapley Bennett, Jr.

I wish to emphasize that I vigorously and categorically disagree with this criticism of American policy in Santo Domingo. It was not my privilege to be in the city of Washington when the decision to intervene was taken. I was not at the conference at the White House at which some of our hindsighters were apprised of the action that would be taken, but I did discuss the matter with the President over the telephone from my home in Georgia.

The President was kind enough to ask me what I thought of the situation. I asked him if there were any indications of a definite Communist influence in the so-called rebel forces. He stated that there was little doubt that there was a definite Communist influence there, and I told him that, in my opinion, he had no alternative other than to proceed to send the Armed Forces to San Domingo to avoid another Cuba.

No one, of course, can know definitely what would have happened had the President not intervened when he did. But we do know that, subsequent to the landing of U.S. troops, the fighting was brought to a halt and we do not have today another Castroite dictatorship in the Caribbean.

I do not know, Mr. President, how it would be possible to measure in exact numbers how many Communists must be involved in an operation of this kind before it becomes dangerous to a republican form of government, or to any other form of government. We do know that a mere handful of Communists took over in Cuba, and many of the most valorous soldiers who assisted Castro in the revolution have been compelled to flee from that island, their homeland, because they are not Communists.

We also know that in the case of Czechoslovakia, a very small percentage of the people of that country were actually Communists; those who were Communists but were smart enough, tough enough, and mean enough to take to the streets with weapons while the peace-loving people took to their homes. As a consequence, Czechoslovakia wound up behind the Iron Curtain.

Mr. President, I do not intend at this time to go into any extensive discussion of what has happened over the world, and recount the instances in which small numbers of Communists have succeeded in taking over the government of countries where the majority of people were anti-Communist. Nor do I wish to go into an extensive discussion of our Dominican policy at this time. I will say, in passing, that I do not have the confidence of some that we will be able to establish a permanent republican form of government in Santo Domingo under the procedures we are now following.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

FAA HUB

In all, 3 dozen companies and half a dozen Government agencies have been involved in the SST development to date. The hub of the program is the Federal Aviation Agency.

The thin line between military and civilian interests in the program is the main source of objection to the SST development.

Senator VANCE HARTKE, Democrat, of Indiana, reportedly plans to question the \$140 million SST appropriation in the Senate because he feels the FAA is becoming militarized. He was against the appointment of Air Force Maj. Gen. William F. McKee as FAA administrator, and now he is upset because Brig. Gen. Jewell C. Maxwell is to replace Gordon Bain as deputy administrator for supersonic transport development.

PRESTIGE IN BALANCE

But any delay in the SST program will probably be monetary, because U.S. prestige rides with development of the plane.

Unless the United States goes ahead with the SST, domestic airlines will probably be forced to buy the supersonic Concorde being developed by Britain and France.

The 1,450-mile-per-hour Concorde is due to be ready for service in 1971 while the present schedule would have a U.S. SST flying by 1974.

THREE-YEAR LAG

Because the U.S. plane will be faster and carry 220 to 250 passengers, as opposed to 118 to 132 for the Concorde, informed sources believe the 3-year lag will not be too damaging.

However, if the U.S. development program falls much further behind the Concorde schedule, airlines would be more or less forced to buy the Concorde to compete. The United States would stand to lose many millions on the export market as well as at home.

Up to now U.S. and foreign airlines have deposited \$9.6 million in advance payments for supersonic transports.

U.S. RESERVATIONS

At the rate of \$100,000 per plane, domestic airlines have reserved 44 delivery positions and foreign lines have reserved 52. The U.S. reservations so far are:

American Airlines, 6; Braniff Airways, 2; Delta Airlines, 3; Northwest Airlines, 4; Pan American, 15; Panagra, 2; and Trans World Airlines, 10.

The FAA estimates that in the 1980's there will be a market for more than 400 U.S. supersonic transports. These planes, the FAA says, should be carrying some 45 percent of all the free world's revenue passenger miles.

MORE THAN DOUBLE

This market could more than double in the 1990's.

With a demand for 400 planes, the industry would have a market in excess of \$10 billion.

Manufacturers estimate 60 percent of this would be spread among 10,000 subcontractors and allied firms in 46 States, providing jobs for 50,000 persons for 20 years.

The aircraft industry estimates the cost of developing this plane for production will be \$1 billion.

STAGGERING COST

Despite this enormous development expense and a staggering cost for each production aircraft, one of the goals of the program is to fly passengers at supersonic speed for the same price they now pay to creep along at 600 miles per hour.

This was one of the major reasons the United States is shooting for a plane with a capacity of 220 or more passengers.

To be sure, there is opposition.

FOOLHARDY VENTURE?

Dr. Bo Lundberg, chief of Sweden's Aeronautical Research Institute, an airplane designer, and one of the most respected fig-

ures in aviation, considers the SST an unnecessary, if not foolhardy, venture.

He insists the sonic boom associated with supersonic flight will create havoc beneath the routes of the supersonics. What's more, he says, door-to-door travel time will not be reduced substantially because ground transportation has not kept up with air transportation, and jetports will have to be located at greater and greater distances from cities.

Passengers who ride the SST will sacrifice comfort, Lundberg says, because much of their flight time will be spent belted into seats while the plane climbs to or descends from its cruising altitude. And more time will be spent sitting in the aircraft on the ground as it prepares for take-off.

SST OUTDATED?

Some visionaries say the SST will be outdated before it ever realizes the potential forecast by its proponents.

This school of thought suggests that 20 years from now, rocket-boostered passenger vehicles will hurl travelers across the seas at near orbital velocities, making cities on opposite sides of the earth less than an hour apart.

But each new generation of commercial air transports has descended from military parentage. And today the military has no active program, which would logically produce this speedy type of civilian travel.

The Dominican Crisis and Its Impact on Hemispheric Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. DOW

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 21, 1965

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, yesterday 52 Members opposed House Resolution 560 stating the sense of the House of Representatives as to U.S. relations in Latin America.

I was among those who opposed the resolution. Since yesterday I have read the following statement published in a newsletter called "Latin American," July 1965, by a department of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America. Had Members read this statement before the vote, I believe that more of them would have voted in opposition to the resolution.

The newsletter follows:

THE DOMINICAN CRISIS AND ITS IMPACT ON HEMISPHERIC RELATIONS

(NOTE.—The Latin America Department, Division of Overseas Ministries, NCCUSA, received on May 26, 1965, the following document signed by four Latin American church leaders.)

We, the undersigned, represent institutions and movements of the evangelical community of Latin America. We play a vital part in these movements—representing churches of the most diverse tradition—whose common goal has been to incarnate and spread the gospel of Jesus Christ in the countries of Latin America throughout the various stages of its history. These are churches which originated in Europe or the United States and have become today a part of our reality, constituting the heart of the nature, the sentiments, the problems and aspirations of the Latin American people. In this double character—as part of the Evangelical Church which recognizes its continuity

in time and space with the Universal Church, and as institutions solidly identified with the destiny of Latin America—we believe it is our urgent duty to make the following declaration about the grave events taking place in the Dominican Republic which affects every sphere of opinion in Latin America today.

I

Nothing could possibly explain Christian indifference and silence—a silence of complicity—confronted as we are with events which are daily causing destruction, death, and terror in a sister nation. And yet it would be an act of irresponsibility on our part if we were to align ourselves with this elemental human problem without analyzing the political, economic, and military elements constituting the root of the situation. This is the aim which has brought us to an analysis of the facts and to a manifestation of our concern.

II

Information coming from various groups leads to little doubt as to the factors provoking the present crisis in the Dominican Republic. The closest point of departure would be the overthrow of President Juan Bosch, who headed the first constitutional government to be established after the long and dismal reign of the dictator, Trujillo. From that day in September 1963, until the unleashing of present events, the country returned to a military regime imposed by a junta which justified its rise against Bosch with a program based on an organized struggle against communism. The junta obtained U.S. Government recognition very soon after President Johnson took office. On April 24, 1965, a new military movement which seemed to have popular support succeeded in overthrowing the junta and was close to resuming power in the name of the constitutional mandate which is in force until 1967. When the struggle appeared almost resolved, the North American Marine Infantry stepped in, initially alleging protection of U.S. citizens and other foreigners in Santo Domingo. Because of the irrefutable evidence of their acts they had to admit later that the purpose of the intervention was to control the revolution due to a supposed participation of Communist elements. During those days, dispatches of every international news service stated that the North American soldiers were taking over for the weakened forces of the official Dominican army and were presenting the final obstacle to the victory of the rebel faction. The Dominican Congress gave its support to the revolution, naming Col. Francisco Camaño constitutional President of this country until the expiration of the lawful term. The North American intervention imposed a momentary truce, with the rebel forces confined to the central zone in Santo Domingo. The opposing faction took advantage of the calm to establish a civilian and military junta to reclaim legal power. The Organization of American States (OAS), which was later to approve North American intervention, decided to mediate and to form a multilateral army with the decisive vote of the Dominican representative who was receiving his instructions from the civilian and military junta. In view of the failure of OAS actions, the U.N. Security Council resolved to intervene directly. Repeated violations of the truce were committed by the civilian and military junta with the obvious support of the North American occupation forces. The rebel government announced its decision to fight to the end and to set the entire city of Santo Domingo on fire should North American intervention continue. A 24-hour truce was agreed upon, and news releases reported more than 1,500 casualties; the city without water or electricity; scarcity of food; the wounded lying on the ground or in hospital beds by twos; surgery being performed without sterilization of in-

struments; and a procession of 20 women dressed in mourning who offered to place themselves in the front lines to force an end to the shooting.

III

This objective description of the events in the Dominican Republic forces one to reflect with great depth on the significance of U.S. intervention in the struggles of internal politics of Latin America. The present situation corroborates, with slight variation, the actual history of hemispheric relations. The United States has intervened, sometimes in the name of the Monroe Doctrine (the continental defense against aggression); at other times for the protection of vested interests (goods or the personal integrity of North American citizens, so called dollar diplomacy); and finally, at other times under the banner of anticommunism, pan-Americanism, or the preservation of democracy. These military interventions by the United States in Latin America, in the Caribbean and Central American countries, have been taking place since 1824 when the double focus was Cuba and Puerto Rico, up to this current demonstration of power, 140 years later, in the Dominican Republic. Mexico, Honduras, Nicaragua, Puerto Rico, Cuba, Colombia, Chile, Panama, and the Dominican Republic have been, on repeated occasions, subject to intervention in 1853, 1854, 1857, 1858, 1860, 1871, 1881, 1885, 1901, 1903, 1904, 1912, 1919, 1926, 1934, 1954, 1961, 1962, and now, in 1965. These interventions are carefully recorded in the histories written in every part of America. These result from a doctrinaire conviction expressed in the theories of North American military intervention of such men as Monroe, Theodore Roosevelt, John Foster Dulles, and President Johnson. In all cases they reflect U.S. abrogation of the right of Latin American countries to modify the course of events and internal politics in accord with their own interests. On the occasion of the Pan American Conference in 1829 which was called by Simon Bolivar in Panama, this U.S. attitude brought forth a bitter sentence from the father of Spanish American independence: "The United States appears to have been chosen by Providence to devastate Latin America with misery in the name of liberty." This sentence remains in the minds of the Latin American people and events throughout history do not permit it to be forgotten.

IV

What have been the causes and effects of U.S. intervention for Latin America? At different times the government and politicians of the country in the north have expressed openly their intention to protect goods and vested interests—the system of life and economic affairs of North American citizens—in any situation which might endanger them. Frequently, this resolution has been exercised by the United States unilaterally, and also, we must note, frequently with the compliance of the Latin American governments involved. It has often been legitimized through treaties and at other times by force of action. The recent invasion of the Dominican Republic constitutes a violation by the United States of the nonintervention and self-determination accord established by the very Organization of American States which punished the Dominican Republic in 1960 under the dictatorship of Trujillo and from which Cuba was expelled in 1961. The North American Government is explicitly aware of the illegality of its action. And, even if a large majority of the governments of Latin America have acquiesced in support of the procedures of the United States, the consequences to the relations between the people of Latin America and North America have nevertheless been devastating. More and more the possibility of understanding, communication, and fruitful dialog appears to recede. More and more the ill will and re-

sentment of the masses in Latin America against the people of North America is exacerbating. More and more the probability of a peaceful and sensible solution of the grave problems affecting the social development of Latin America seems to fade away. Instead the increase of hostility, ill will, and disillusionment of the Latin American people has reduced the hope of arriving at a real and necessary understanding between both peoples in the immediate future.

V

Due to this situation, Latin America cannot but trust in its own forces to bring to realization its hopes for modernization and progress. But within each nation there are other obstacles, and in every case, the moral and material support of the United States is given to the forces opposing progress and committed to the maintenance of the historically indefensible "status quo." The remaining alternatives confronting the vast popular sectors urgently demanding profound structural reforms in the economic and social systems are of a socialistic and nationalistic tendency, which contradicts the North American way of life. The latest events in the Dominican Republic and in other nations in Latin America corroborate the inevitability of such an option. What then, is the hope for the future? How is there to be involvement toward the re-establishment—or should we say, a genuine establishment—of fraternal relations between the peoples of the South and North, and in short, among all peoples?

VI

It is the belief of the signers of this document that the specific contribution which we, as Christians, must make in this decisive moment is the difficult one of a ministry of reconciliation. From the humane and political points of view nothing seems as inappropriate at this time as an emphasis on reconciliation. But it is exactly at these tensest moments in history when God demands this particular mission from Christians. Who else is able to speak of reconciliation at this hour but He who reconciled the world to Himself through the sacrifice of the cross? From what other source can the basis for real and permanent understanding between men be found but in the "good news" which announces God's will to make himself man in Jesus Christ to better express his love and concern for man? But true reconciliation can only be realized upon the foundations of repentance, humility, responsibility and forgiveness. The concrete task which is demanded of Christians in every part of America in this hour is to speak the hard word of truth. We must point out our own guilt and the guilt of our governments in the events in the Dominican Republic. We must assume as much as possible our social, political and in short, historical responsibility, in order to contribute in a positive way to the overcoming of the conditions which oppose the humanization of man in Latin and North America. This is the concrete significance which the ministry of reconciliation assumes in this hour. We do not doubt that the task is heavy and difficult. Only through this thorny path did God offer in Jesus Christ the most difficult, sacrificial and also the most glorious reconciliation.

For the Latin American Board of Church and Society:

Rev. LUIS E. ODELL,
General Secretary.

For the Latin American Union of Evangelical Youth:

Rev. OSCAR BOLIOLI,
Executive Secretary.

For the Student Christian Movement:

Dr. LEONARDO FRANCO,
Secretary for Latin America.

For the Commission on Latin American Evangelical Unity:

Rev. EMILIO CASTRO,
Coordinator.

All Is Not So Good in the Great Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES D. MARTIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 21, 1965

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the American people have been so dazzled by the barrage of White House press releases and the almost continuous soap opera appearances of the President on TV extolling his personal greatness and the blessings he has bestowed upon what he hopes is a grateful people, that the actual cost of his many schemes has been practically ignored.

But surely there must come a day of reckoning for the wild spending this subservient Congress has engaged in at the demands of the President. Like the drunk who inevitably suffers the morning-after headache after a wild night of orgy, the day must come when we must face up to the mess of the Great Society instead of realizing the utopian dreams cooked up by White House speech writers.

The tragedy will be, not only in the cost in money, which may well bankrupt us as a Nation, but in the human misery which will be caused by the failures of the programs which have been oversold and over-promised in the mad scramble for votes.

Every American may well join Stewart Alsop in his recent column in the Saturday Evening Post, and the Wall Street Journal of September 21 in its editorial in asking the question—"Where Are We Going?"

I include the editorial from the Wall Street Journal as a part of these remarks in the hope that Congress and the American people may stop to think about where we may be going by way of the Great Society before it is too late and there will be no place to go, but down.

The editorial follows:

WHERE WE ARE GOING

Where do we go from here?—or rather, where does the administration go? Stewart Alsop raises the question in the Saturday Evening Post, and it is eminently worth asking.

The point, of course, is that the present session of Congress will have seen the enactment of so much "Great Society" legislation that it is a little difficult to envisage bold new programs for 1966. Medicare and a flock of other measures once considered hotly debatable may prove hard to top.

For our part, we have confidence in officialdom's inventiveness when it comes to spending schemes or, as someone has put it, in creating nonexistent problems to solve. In fact, some of the President's advisers are already at work trying to devise a dazzling legislative display for next year.

Persuading the country of the urgency of spectacular new Federal undertakings may be a different matter, especially after this year's orgy. As it is, there are scattered signs of public restiveness and doubts, a feeling that the President and Congress are attempting to do too much too fast.

One ground for doubt pertains to the efficacy of the programs. The costly anti-poverty effort is both a political gravy-train and a bureaucratic horror, but it is far from clear that it is doing much for the poor. Many reasons exist for suspecting that medi-

for 29 heads of state on every continent while working with MRA.

The patriotic smash hit was produced this summer with talent collected from the 7,000 youths who attended the MRA Mackinac demonstration.

The movement for Moral Rearmament was born here in 1939 at the Hollywood Bowl under the belief that the world needed to return to principles of morality, character, and integrity.

Since then it has spread all over the world. Last month more than 4,000 people thronged a hall in the Nation's Capital to view the variety show which was sponsored there by 96 Congressmen and 54 foreign ambassadors.

Also present at this morning's assemblies were former Rams all-star, Dan Tyler, Supervisor Kenneth Hahn, and J. Blanton Belk, U.S. director of Moral Rearmament. Tyler greeted the students.

Mr. Speaker, on the following day, September 17, the Herald-Examiner commented editorially on "Sing Out, 1965" and urged attendance at a performance that was given in the Hollywood Bowl on the 19th.

The editorial follows:

En route to Japan for a series of performances, Moral Rearmament's organization will present its play "Sing Out, 1965" in the Hollywood Bowl next Sunday night. We heartily recommend a large attendance from the local area for this inspiring production.

Moral Rearmament strongly believes that the one thing the free world has lacked in the struggle with communism is an ideology to capture the minds of the people of the underprivileged nations.

Los Angeles County Supervisor Warren M. Dorn, who saw the performance at Mackinac Island, Mich., said of it:

"The message of 'Sing Out, 1965' should be announced American foreign policy. Because of the acute need for more understanding, greater tolerance, and better communications between race groups in our area, it is our firm opinion that this should be seen here by as many as the bowl will hold."

The advice was heeded, Mr. Speaker, because a crowd of 15,000 was on its feet for 10 minutes shouting for more, and refusing to let the cast close the show.

Said one senior businessman:

I have been to the bowl for 30 years and this is the finest show I have ever seen.

The president of the student body of the University of Southern California ran up to the cast at the conclusion and said:

We are going to have this on our campus. Give me a date.

Mr. Speaker, prior to the Watts appearance of "Sing Out, 1965," the Nashville Banner commented on the MRA group's current tour of the Far East, coming to the conclusion that: "If charity begins at home, so do patriotism and moral responsibility."

I sincerely hope and pray, Mr. Speaker, that when this fine group has finished its foreign tour, it will be able to appear on each and every college campus in the United States. We have a lot of work to do here at home, Mr. Speaker, in getting our own house in order. MRA has demonstrated that it can be of tremendous help in this task.

The Nashville Banner editorial follows:

FOR MORAL REARMAMENT—"SING OUT 65" HAS A JOB TO DO AT HOME FIRST

The most heartening spectacle to come upon the American scene after several years

of planned confusion and contempt for authority is the moral rearmament program for the youth of the country.

Those who have joined the movement represent cleanliness of mind and body versus promiscuity and the need of a bath and a haircut. The MRA'ers are not ashamed to express their belief in God or their love of country. And they seem to get a hearty enjoyment out of disciplined living without rolling in the gutter and thumbing their noses at religion and decency.

This new and youthful force has been through a strenuous training course at Mackinac Island. They believe the time has come to jerk the microphone from the minority, but image-stealing college pacifists, and speak up for the "true" America.

This is a fresh voice crying in the wilderness of demonstrations and violent "non-violence."

"We're interested in building a new society with backbone, patriotism and character," they say. "Follow us," they chorus, "and we will turn the world right side up again."

That's fine, but it's a pretty big order, even for unconquerable and idealistic youth.

Those who have followed with admiration the moral rearmament program cheer too when word comes of the applause given the whistlestop show "Sing Out 65" as it moves toward the west coast.

But after the performance in Los Angeles, the MRA'ers take to chartered planes for the Orient. Instead they should turn back and crisscross the United States until every city of any size is visited.

With the beatnik riffraff promising nationwide campus chaos in the name of pacifism, as the country goes deeper into war, what a contrast "Sing Out 65" would make.

St. Louis and Nashville, even more than Tokyo or Seoul, need to hear the voices of clean young people raised in song for America and expressing a willingness to die, if need be, for America.

Foreigners for moral rearmament say the rest of the world is looking to the United States and where this country leads, the world will follow.

Then let's get the United States straight first. It won't be if the national campus stage is left clear for a minority of long-haired, amoral litterbugs to sneer at the flag and steal the show.

If charity begins at home, so do patriotism and moral responsibility.

Scholar Fulbright's Strange Logic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 21, 1965

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, there are so many spokesmen for the administration these days whose remarks are interpreted as being official that they must undergo objective analysis. Columnist David Lawrence, in his article yesterday entitled "Scholar Fulbright's Strange Logic" in very proper and timely fashion analyzed the recent questionable comments of the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

The article follows:

SCHOLAR FULBRIGHT'S STRANGE LOGIC

(By David Lawrence)

Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, studied as a Rhodes

scholar in England and must have familiarized himself with the British parliamentary system.

If FULBRIGHT had been a Member of the House of Commons and had made the same kind of speech as he delivered in the Senate the other day—saying, in effect, that the leader of the majority party had bungled in handling a grave international problem—it would have been regarded either as a call for a "vote of confidence or no confidence" by the people, or the removal of the critic himself from the councils of his party.

But political parties in the United States have no such system of discipline. FULBRIGHT will continue to hold his post as a spokesman of the Democratic Party in the Senate on foreign relations.

FULBRIGHT insists that he wasn't exactly blaming President Johnson for what he regards as a blundering policy in intervening with military force in the Dominican Republic. The Senator attributes this instead to "faulty advice" given Johnson by his advisers at the time of the crisis. The Senator doesn't say to what extent Secretary of State Dean Rusk was at fault and whether he should be removed, but the impression conveyed is that the President of the United States is either a gullible person or not as perceptive as FULBRIGHT himself would have been if he had happened to be President or Secretary of State.

FULBRIGHT is considered one of the modern intellectuals, but his speech is a little difficult for a nonintellectual to understand. He says for instance:

"The question of the degree of Communist influence (in the Dominican Republic) is, therefore, crucial, but it cannot be answered with certainty. The weight of the evidence is that Communists did not participate in planning the revolution—indeed there is some indication that it took them by surprise—but that they very rapidly began to try to take advantage of it and to seize control of it. The evidence does not establish that the Communists at any time actually had control of the revolution. There is little doubt that they had influence within the revolutionary movement but the degree of that influence remains a matter of speculation."

"The point I am making is not—most emphatically not—that there was no Communist participation in the Dominican crisis, but simply that the administration acted on the premise that the revolution was controlled by Communists—a premise which it failed to establish at the time and has not established since."

"Intervention on the basis of Communist participation as distinguished from control of the Dominican revolution was a mistake of panic and timidity which also reflects a grievous misreading of the temper of contemporary Latin American politics."

FULBRIGHT evidently doesn't believe in fire hoses or fire apparatus being used when there's a smouldering fire but only when it has burst into flame and a property has already been virtually destroyed. He seems to have forgotten that the American policy in 1949, which assumed that a coalition in China with the Communists would be a recognition of a "social revolution," wound up with the loss of the mainland to the Communist Chinese. Similar vacillation and hesitancy on the part of the United States lost Cuba to Fidel Castro and the Communists.

FULBRIGHT concedes that a Communist-dominated government might have emerged in the Dominican Republic. He rationalizes, however, that "this might conceivably have happened, but the evidence by no means supports the conclusion that it would have happened." He declares that "we based our policy on a possibility rather than on anything approaching a likelihood."

So the Arkansas Senator feels that the judgment of President Johnson, Secretary

of State Rusk and the American ambassador who was dodging bullets on the spot in Santo Domingo was, as to speak, "faulty."

FULBRIGHT thinks that the United States shouldn't have landed troops to save American lives or to save Latin America from more of such revolutions but simply should have waited on the sidelines until the Communist mission was actually accomplished. Would it have been another fiasco like the Bay of Pigs? Only FULBRIGHT knows.

Latins Want Change—Not Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 21, 1965

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I believe it unfortunate that House Resolution 560 was presented on the floor yesterday. The House resolution according to its terms states that:

Any subversive threat (of communism) violates the Monroe Doctrine and any contracting party (country) to the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance may resort to armed force to forestall and combat control and colonization (by communism).

A few words have been omitted from the quoted purpose, but the sense is apparently clear.

Certainly the United States should have learned some things from recent diplomatic history. We have won many friends in Latin America in modern times, probably really beginning with the F.D.R. "good neighbor" policy and the enactment of the Reciprocal Trade Treaties. This friendship has flourished from time to time and reached its culmination in the Organization of American States and the Alliance for Progress programs. Many in the Latin world are true friends of America. Of others, their friendship has been dulled by lack of substantial Latin American progress in spite of the largest hemispheric aid program in history.

Many in Latin America want change. They resort to communism in Chile where 24 percent are registered in that party, not because of Russian submarines off the coast or parachuting Red Chinese infiltrators, but because 600,000 people can't live like animals in Santiago seeing much of the aid money go into military weapons and being filtered off at the top by the 100 ruling families.

The Alliance for Progress in Latin America should be aimed at short circuiting the military juntas and selfish power blocks wherever possible in an all out effort to effectuate "change" at the grass-roots by helping plain people to better their standard of living. During the last year we have helped Socialist President Frei of Chile take steps to effect "change"—he has the vision and the power to stop communism in its tracks.

Our fine relations with the Chilean people were slightly confounded with our entry into the Dominican Republic—not because Chile is for communism but because she resented the interference in the affairs of a sovereign state where a clear

case of outside intervention was not made out in violation of the Monroe Doctrine.

This is much like in a criminal case when the court throws out an indictment based on unlawful search and seizure. The court takes the action not because it favors the criminal, but because the Bill of Rights is paramount. Irrespective, I think the Dominican Republic action can be rationalized in defense of the administration, especially with the action by the O.A.S.

When the Congress then passes House Resolution 560 which would appear to lock in concrete Dominican Republic-type policy for the future—a policy of force for the United States or any of the Americas based on a fragmentary threat—it is readily foreseeable that America will be further embarrassed in her relationship with her "good neighbors."

If we then confound this by establishing quotas on hemispheric immigration to protect ourselves from hemispheric Communists, we will, in fact, lay the cornerstone for chaos in the Americas for the balance of the 20th century.

To tell any Latin dictator that he can forcibly meddle, with our approval, in the affairs of his neighbor that may or may not have a substantial Communist Party on the theory that he is forcibly suppressing a Communist threat, can only have the effect of, in fact, stimulating the forces of communism and diminishing American stature on these continents.

A Birch-type philosophy does not work in the United States. Why should it work outside?

Equality in Bank Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD D. MCCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 9, 1965

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of my colleagues to an excellent editorial which appeared in the Buffalo Evening News of September 9. I think it states very persuasively the case for applying the same Federal rules governing bank mergers to the creation of bank holding companies.

The editorial follows:

EQUALITY IN BANK LAWS

As a matter of sound public policy, it seems reasonable that Federal rules governing bank mergers should apply equally to amalgamations which follow the holding company route as a way of strengthening credit and financing resources available to the public.

Yet unless the House does some fixing in a Senate-approved bill, discriminatory treatment of past and future holding company acquisitions is in prospect. The threat banking authorities fear in such a double standard—in the way it could play hob with stability, confidence, and equal competition in the banking business—is a matter of legitimate public concern.

The background on this issue is complicated, but in brief the Senate bill attempts to clear up the present confusion surrounding the power of the Attorney General to

break up bank mergers after these already have a clean bill of health from the Federal regulatory agencies, including the Federal Reserve Board.

The Justice Department now can bring antitrust actions long after merger applications have agency certification that they serve the public convenience and necessity as well as satisfying competitive factors. To end the suspense and uncertainty hanging over such mergers, the Senate bill would keep the Attorney General in the act, with a 30-day period during which mergers could be forestalled by bringing antitrust proceedings. Banks that have merged without such court contests would thereafter be exempt from antitrust prosecution—and spared the agony of being forced to "unscramble" their assets and operations.

The case for making such rules uniform throughout the banking industry was argued persuasively in the House committee testimony of Baldwin Maull, of Buffalo, president of the Marine Midland Corp. Speaking as president of the Association of Registered Bank Holding Companies—representing 25 such consolidations across the country—Mr. Maull urged adoption of an amendment affording similar protection to them and their customers against the threat of subsequent upheavals long after bank acquisitions are accomplished facts.

In the States where both bank holding companies and branch banking are permitted, Mr. Maull noted, most holding companies have merged acquired banks into other affiliates. Thus unscrambling a bank holding company could involve breaking up not only the acquisition itself but also the mergers—even though the latter were immune from the antitrust laws.

Perpetuation of a legal threat against established holding companies, moreover, would put them at a competitive disadvantage with the merger approach to the pooling of credit resources and managerial services for the public industry, and major financial undertakings. "The banking public again will be the real party to suffer," contended Mr. Maull, if the benefits and services available to a single bank—and usually beyond its capacity to duplicate—are severely disrupted or curtailed.

Resolution of Congratulations and Commendation to Mr. and Mrs. John A. Jenkins and Family

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BUCHANAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 20, 1965

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, one of my distinguished constituents, John A. "Buck" Jenkins of Birmingham, and a native of Geneva, Ala., has recently completed his term as commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States. I want to take this opportunity to extend hearty congratulations to him.

His outstanding record of achievement while in office is the result of his personal dedication and contribution in time, energy, and untiring effort as commander in chief of the VFW.

Mr. Jenkins attended school at Marion Institute, at Washington-Lee University, Birmingham Southern College, and Birmingham School of Law, and passed